

REQUEST FOR 1803 HALF CENTS TO STUDY IN LAS VEGAS

I am researching the die states of the 1803 C-3 and 1803 C-4 half cent varieties. Results will be submitted for publication in *Penny-Wise*. Contributors will be acknowledged with their permission. If you own a VF or better 1803 C-3 half cent, or believe you have an unusual die state, please bring your coin(s) to EAC in Las Vegas.

I am also interested in seeing any 1803 C-4 half cent believed to have no reverse clash marks (Breen State I), or to be later than Breen State II. See you in Las Vegas, and thanks!

Ron Manley
114 Polo Drive
Salisbury, NC 28144
(704) 638 - 0747

REGION 6 GET TOGETHER IN LAS VEGAS

Several people in our Region have requested that we improve communications and organize regional meetings during the year. Because of the large geographical area that our Region covers, I have only been marginally successful in responding to either request. A meeting at ANA was organized. However, my schedule does not allow for much additional travel within our Region for the remainder of this year.

If possible, I will arrange for a meeting room in Las Vegas where we can take 30 minutes or so to discuss how best to address these issues. Perhaps Friday afternoon at 4:00 PM? I will have a notice posted at Chris Victor-McCawley's table at the convention with a definite time and place for our get together. I look forward to seeing everyone from Region 6 there [that's New Mexico, Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Missouri, and Kansas].

Rick Coleman
Chairman, Region 6
EAC #3351

5B

Subj: **Re: Thin planchets**
Date: 6/11/98 4:26:40 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Hi Tett:

Good to hear from you. Sorry I couldn't be more positive about your theory, but it's better than making stuff up as so many have.

Glad you liked the stats article - this stuff really isn't tough, it's merely probability theory. If you've seen my reply to Red's rebuttal in the most recent PW, I'm a bit peeved w/ Harry. He edited the article, which is his right, but in the process he introduced numerous typos & ran paragraphs together destroying the legibility. I am writing to him to express my displeasure.

Anyway, stay in touch. I'm down to the archives every so often & if there's anything you'd like me to check on just let me know.

Best, Craig

6

Subj: **three items**
Date: 6/13/98 11:25:59 AM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Ron

1. Talked to Bill Weber. He does not remember which thin planchet lettered edge half cents he was referring to in the article ten years ago.
2. Do you know a collector named Enoch Blackwell?
3. I will check my mail Monday morning and try to get you the rotation information you want. If I don't get your flip Monday I will take care of it when I return, probably around the end of June. Just to make sure I get you everything you want, please send me a detailed e-mail sometime this weekend with a full description and listing of the coins.

Regards, Tett

Tett,

I do not know Enoch Blackwell. Should I?

I would appreciate reverse rotation data on the half cent varieties: 1794 C-2b, 1794 C-3b, and 1794 C-6b; 1797 C-3c (gripped edge); 1808 C-1; 1809 C-5 LDS, with obverse cuds (unique, ex. Cohen).

If it's not too much trouble, could you also check your 1831 C-1 (s) with a glass to see if you note Breen's reverse crack for 1832 C-1—described as from the rim through the right side of A in STATES to the wreath? If present, it will be faint.

Just do the best you can with the rotation measurements. They take some time getting used to.

Good luck, and again...thanks!!

Ron

114 Polo Drive
Salisbury, NC 28144
June 24, 1996

To R. Tetterhurst:
Your address is not known to me.
I know you are not in the 1/200
Survey but would appreciate your
input on this study. I have asked
Del Bland to forward this request to you.
Thanks,
-Ron

Dear Half Cent Collector,

I am doing a survey of half cent collectors listed in the 1/200 Survey and Directory as owners of 1804 Cohen-7 half cents. I plan to do a study investigating the rarity of 1804 C-7 half cents by Breen die state. The study will be written for submission to *Penny-Wise*. All owner information will remain strictly confidential. Please take a few minutes to fill out the form below and mail it back to me in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. Thank you!

Breen Die States of 1804 Cohen-7 Half Cents

State I. Perfect reverse die. No cracks whatsoever.

State II. Very faint crack through top of F in OF extending right and left.

State III. The crack of State II extends to rim above O, and more heavily to rim above AM. Later, it extends faintly through tops of AMER.

State IV. Faint crack through tops of TES.

State V. The crack of State IV extends faintly through tops of D STA.

State VI. Heavy rim break (cud) over OF A touching top of F.

State VII. Rim break (cud) extends to cover top of O.

State VIII. Additional rim break (cud) over OF A touching top of F.

State IX. A third rim break (cud) covering tops of TES.

Best regards,



Ron Manley, EAC #3909

Please return this part in the enclosed postage-paid envelope.

<u>1804 C-7 Specimens Owned</u>	<u>Breen Die State</u>	<u>Net Grade</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

8

Subj: Rotation
Date: 98-06-22 11:40:51 EDT
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Ron

Thanks for the new flip and instructions. Promise to take better care of this one. It didn't arrive before I left, but it is my first order of business now that I am back. I am also listing the location of the six o'clock mark on the obverse to give you an added point of reference. This will help you confirm whether or not I had the obverse properly aligned. Here are my observations:

- 1794 2b Reverse orientation is about 12:20, according to my best estimate. The 6 o'clock line on the obverse is between the 7 and the 9 of the date.
- 1794 3b 12:20 Line between the 9 and the 4.
- 1794 6b 12:05 Between 9 and 4.
- 1796 1 11:55 Between 7 and 9, but closer to 9
- 1797 3c My id# 2 12:15 Line at 7.
- 1797 3c #4 12:15 At 7.
- 1797 3c #3 12:30 This is a very rough estimate, because the coin is almost completely worn at this point. It could be 12:15 like the other two. At 7.
- 1808 1 12:30 Between first 8 and 0.
- 1809 5 with cuds. Cohen Sale lot 278. 12:00. At 8.

Obviously these are estimates, but I tried to be as careful as possible. Hope the data is helpful. I thought the article you wrote was very fair. The only suggestion I might have is that you have enough data on these weights to separate my specimens into those which are within the range of variations in other varieties and those which are below other known specimens. Also I wrote Craig Sholley to ask if he had seen anything in the correspondence of that era to support or contradict the hypothesis. Send me your mailing address and I will send you a copy of his response, which was not supportive of the hypothesis. But of course that was part of the answer I was searching for. Don't quote him without his permission.

Keep up the good work on your research.

Tett

9

Subj: **Reply to data**
Date: 6/23/98 4:56:01 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
Reply-to: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Greetings Tett,

Several things. First, my mailing address for the Craig Sholley correspondence is: Ron Manley, 114 Polo Drive, Salisbury, NC 28144. My phone number FYI is (704) 638-0747. Thanks again for the reverse rotation data. It was very helpful.

I have some unfortunate news: I have concluded that Cohen:278 (your 1809 C-5 coin with the apparent obverse cuds) must be an altered early die state coin. I discussed this on the phone this A.M. with Bob Grellman who is editing my book manuscript. Therefore, I will not list this coin as a unique example of the "terminal" die state. My reasons for this conclusion are summarized as follows: (1) It is extremely improbable that a die would break simultaneously forming two large cuds and a smaller one without pre-existing cracks in the areas of the breaks. (2) The coin's weight is suspiciously low: 72.84 grains rather than about 84 grains. (3) The coin's reverse (as seen from the Cohen sale plate and photos by Frank Wilkinson) shows the lower ribbon at 6:00 to be well-struck. Dentilation is evident from about 4:30 to 9:00. True LDS 1809 C-5 specimens are from heavily lapped dies and, as a result, the lower ribbon is very weak even on uncirculated specimens. Lapping also removes most of the dentilation. Typical high grade LDS specimens have dentilation on the reverse only from about 5:30 to 8:00. (4) You reported your coin with a normal 12:00 reverse alignment. This is the same as found for EDS 1809 C-5 specimens. LDS 1809 C-5 specimens with lapped dies are found with a CW-rotated reverse around 12:45.

Bob Grellman said I should mention why I am omitting this 1809 C-5's "die state" from my book so that readers will know that it's not an oversight. I would like to write up my comments about this coin for Penny-Wise but I will do so ONLY if you give me your permission to do so.

If you are not too upset with me, I'd like your assistance once again. Briefly, I was quite surprised that the "gripped edge" 1797 C-3c half cents in your collection have a different rotation from that of "plain edge" and "lettered edge" 1797 C-3 coins. Perhaps, this is due to different die states for the "gripped edge" coins. You reported three "gripped edge" coins all rotated CW about 12:15. I am aware of plain and lettered edge coins ONLY having a CCW rotation of about 11:30. Tett, could you check your 1797 C-3a and C-3b specimens to see if any of them share the same rotation as you reported for 1797 C-3c? This is a real mystery to me at this point.

Finally, regarding the issue of the status of thin planchet lettered edge half cents. I am not currently aware of 1793-1794 lettered edge specimens (other than the six you reported) within the weight range of 80 to 89 grains. If you have access to a scale or balance, it would be great if you could take it to the next EAC convention to weigh early half cents. If a notice is placed in the P-W before the convention there might be dozens or

10

even hundreds of early date half cents whose weights could be determined. This, hopefully, would resolve the status of these curious light-weight coins.

You didn't reply whether you checked your 1831 C-1 half cent(s) for the 1832 C-1 reverse crack. If you did check, what (may I ask) did you find? Sorry for such a long note.

Ron

Subj: **Re: Reply to data**
Date: 6/24/98 2:14:14 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

11

Ron

Of course you should write about the 1809 C5 for Penny Wise. It is considerate of you to ask my permission, but there is no way whatsoever that I should interfere with the publication of legitimate research results. Knowledge is even more desirable than coins to acquire, since it can be shared with everyone. I am not "upset" with you, as you suggest in your letter. In fact, I congratulate you on the quality of your analysis. You do not need to mention my name in your article. But if you want to quote "the current owner" as to the comments I made above about permission to publish, it might set a good example for some of those who are reluctant to share information that might be financially adverse to them. That is up to you if you feel it fits within the context of your article.

In your March PW article on weights you list the minimum weight for a 1795 plain edge S-stock half cent as 103.1 gr. However, I have a 1795 C6b showing large cent undertype which weighs 83.1 grains. It was lot #95 in the EAC 1997 sale, so you can look it up.

With respect to the gripped edge 1797s, I would assume that they were all made at the same time, possibly quite different from the time when the plain and lettered edge coins were made. Maybe even in 1798 or 1799. I have this vision that someone complained about the lack of lettering on the edge. So the mint tried lettering some again. Nope, the letters run off the edge, just like we found in 1795. Well, what else have we got? There is this ugly random marking device. Try a few. Whew, they are ugly all right! Let's just forget about edge markings. There really hasn't been any problem with the plain edge coins yet.

I will check on the rotation of the other C3s and the die crack on my 1831 C1s and get back to you

Congratulations again on your analysis of Cohen lot 278.

Tett

12

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Subj: **Thanks!**
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Date: 6/24/98 3:19:42 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
Reply-to: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Tett,

Your generosity is exceeded only by the quality of your half cent collection! I am aware of the light weight 1795 C-6 with cent undertype from the EAC sale. I give comments about how I "classify" it in yet another article that I have submitted to Harry Salyards on the usage of the terms Variety and Subvariety. I look forward to your additional data. Thanks again.

Ron

Subj: Re: Thanks!
Date: 6/25/98 3:27:47 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Ron

Various items. I have two 1832 C1's. One has a crack from the A in STATES through two leaves to a berry. The other one has no part of the crack. I have three 1831 C1's. None has any portion of the above crack.

I have two 1797 3a's which are clear enough to indicate the reverse rotation. Both of these appear to be exactly at 12:00. Possibly I am measuring these slightly differently from the way you do, but I tried to follow your instructions precisely. For comparison, the 6 o'clock mark is directly under the first 7. There are a number of others, but I can't determine the rotation because they are either too low-grade or have large cent undertype which hides the upper leaves.

Similar to the plain edge coins, four of my lettered edge ones appear to have a reverse rotation at 12:00. One has a rotation I calculate as 12:10.

My duplicate 1796 C1 is low-grade and slabbed, but I think the rotation can be seen to be about 11:45.

Sometime when we know we are going to be in the same place at the same time I can bring some of my 1797's with various edges so that you can verify my observations as to rotation.

I have looked very carefully at Cohen 278 and cannot see any physical sign of alteration. I have used 10X magnification and there are no indications of scraping, etc. I am going to try to find higher magnification. I still find your analysis powerfully persuasive, but if it is a deliberate alteration it is very cleverly done!

Hope all this is useful to you.

Regards, Tett

Subj: **Cohen:278**
Date: 6/25/98 7:31:33 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
Reply-to: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Tett,

I have completed a first draft article about the 1809 C-5. I think the most logical explanation for the cuds was that they were unintentionally created to repair rim damage sometime in the distant past. I don't think it at all likely that there was an intent to deceive. An additional piece of "evidence" that the coin is an altered early die state is that the reverse appears to be slightly "offset misaligned", to use Breen's term. In other words, the obverse die appears normally centered but the reverse die is slightly misaligned resulting in a somewhat broader rim than normal at 6:00. This is seen on EDS 1809 C-5 specimens, such as Cohen:275, but has not been observed (by me at least) on any LDS 1809 C-5 specimens, with lapped dies.

As an experiment, yesterday evening I took a pre-1982 Lincoln cent and intentionally added rim damage. I then created in only a few minutes a rather decent looking artificial cud similar to that seen on Cohen:278 (using only a hammer, a file, and a block of wood), removing the rim damage. I believe a similar type event created Cohen:278.

Thanks for the new rotation data. I think you've cleared up the 1797 C-3c mystery.

Best regards,

Ron

15

Subj: **Additional comments**
Date: 6/25/98 10:18:13 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
Reply-to: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Tett,

A few brief thoughts: (1) Do you consider the "first 7" for the 1797 C-3 half cents to be the 7 adjacent to the 1 or the 7 at the end of the date? (2) Have you seen Breen's comments in section 4 on page 469 of his half cent book? (3) If you'd like to see a plated LDS example of 1809 C-5 you might want to check out lot 64 from the Norweb sale, Part I.

Regards,

Ron

Subj: **Re: Additional comments**
Date: 6/27/98 10:36:26 AM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Ron,

When I mention the first 7 in 1797, I am referring to the 7 between the 1 and the 9.

Yes, I have seen the Breen comments on the rollers. The process is clear, and it explains the variations in weight for the planchets cut from spoiled large cents, for example. However, it does nothing to shed any light on the motivation for the TPLE's. They could have been deliberate or accidentally light. By the way, I wrote Walter in prison a few times. In one of the letters I explained my trial piece hypothesis and asked him if he had known of any TPLE's other than the Brobston 1795 #1. At that point I was aware of six of the ten pieces in my article. Walter answered me that he had not previously known of any others. He said that my theory could possibly be correct, but that it would be impossible to prove without corroboration in the archives that such coins had been intentionally produced.

Thanks for reference to the Norweb coin, which I looked up. I can see the ribbon weakness to which you refer, and the denticles.

Your explanation of the cuds as having been created during a correction of edge damage seems to eliminate the low weight reason for doubting the genuineness of the cuds. However, your die state analysis is stronger and is not weakened by the edge damage explanation.

I have been looking very closely at Cohen #278, of course. It seems to me that the 1 of the date is very slightly different in shape from the same numeral on other examples I have of that variety. It seems to be slightly taller and slightly thinner on the Cohen coin than on the others. If my eyes are not playing tricks on me, that would appear to be additional confirmation that something happened to the coin long after it left the mint. I'm not sure which specific explanation it supports, however. Did your experiment with the Lincoln pennies produce any change in the shape of nearby numerals or letters? A hammer could do that, certainly. But logic would indicate that the numeral would be made wider, not thinner, when hammered. A puzzle inside a mystery within an enigma !

Tett

17a

Subj: Re: Additional comments
Date: 6/27/98 4:51:16 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
Reply-to: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Tett,

It's certainly possible, of course, that the low weight of Cohen:278 is unrelated to its presumably altered die state. My assumption is that its low weight is artificial, not the result of a naturally thin planchet. I could be wrong, as I have no evidence. However, its weight is very unusual for a Classic Head half cent. It just seems to me that it would be quite a coincidence if this coin combined a unique die state on an extremely rare light-weight planchet.

I wouldn't make too much about a slight variation in the shape of the 1. It is, after all, a well-worn coin. Tett, can you tell on the reverse if the small lump below the second A in AMERICA is still visible? I can't tell from photos. It's possible the coin's wear is too extensive to see this feature. However, LDS specimens don't show this lump.

On reverse rotation measurements: I think I conveyed to you inadequate (perhaps, inaccurate, may be a better term) instructions. For most half cents, my comments are applicable about having the date at the 6:00 position. However, the most critical thing I attempt to do when measuring reverse rotations is to keep Ms. Liberty oriented in a vertical or "standing" position. This is the orientation the Breen plate coins tend to be shown in.

For 1797 C-3a, b, and c this means I basically measure the 6:00 position from the second 7, not the 7 between the 1 and the 9 as you did. This induces a difference of about 15 degrees (30 min CCW) between your measurements and mine for these varieties. Thus, I can "convert" your readings to mine by subtracting 30 min. For example, your 1797 C-3a rotation at 12:00 becomes my 11:30 and your 1797 C-3c rotation at 12:15 becomes my 11:45.

You wrote that you measured your 1808 C-1's from the first 8. I measure its rotation between the 0 and the 2nd 8. This induces a difference between your measurements and mine of about 15 min CCW (half that of 1797 C-3). Thus, your 1808 C-1 measurement of 12:30 equals mine of about 12:15. This is in agreement with the value I obtained from a pressing I have of this variety.

We both measured 1809 C-5's rotation at the 8, so our rotations should agree here. Does my interpretation of how we measured these rotations (and the conversions I've suggested) make sense to you? I appreciate your point of view. It will help me clarify my wording on how to make rotation measurements in my book.

About the thin planchet lettered edge coins: I agree with Walter Breen that without supportive historical records it would not be possible to "prove" your intriguing hypothesis. However, if specimens of 1794 C-4a or other 1793-1794 lettered edge varieties were to turn up in the weight range of about 80-90 grains, I believe it would effectively "disprove" your

1804 C7

\$180

- unattributed 060. 30 as to wear
- B 1 VF30 10 (15) "BU" by non-copper (non-competent, non-honorable) dealer
State 0 slight doubling I or II Weak strike in this area. Crack visible for only a short distance to R. of F
- D 2 VF20+20 (15) ^{Hawson "30"} State 1 Very thin planchet ex Showers
III+ crack to AME can't see it to R listed in Green as state II
- F 3 VF35 (30) ^{Hawson 30+} State 3 (30) and not to 0 listed in Green as state III
III as below
- G 4 VF 25 20+ (20) 3 III Gid touches F, not O, to rim over AZ
- H 5 VF 20 15 (12) 3+ and exactly as "intermediate die state" in Cohen 2
and cracks from this and three tops of ME (not A)
top of ATE to rim over S2 III and to rim over A2. Crack from
Picture of crack to ME and still in Br.
- I 6 G5 (4) " III and top of O to top of R and rim over I
Crack from rim thru top upper corner of T thru T just above its base
thru bottom of E to lower left of S. Flakes out below
this crack? - die sunk - no cud
- E 7 G4 (3) " IV
- A 8 VG10 (12) State I Better than .1! Ex Cohen Sale lot 175
clearly state I
- C 9 F15 (15) State III "Sl crack over OF A"
ERT → Earlier than .2 " lot 176

17b

hypothesis. Conversely, if a couple hundred or so additional lettered edge half cents were weighed without turning up any thin planchet specimens from varieties other than the ones you have found, I think this would add considerable weight (no pun intended) to your hypothesis. This is why I have suggested to you the idea of weighing large numbers of them at a future EAC convention. Perhaps, this idea isn't feasible but the results should be interesting regardless, don't you think?

Ron

Subj: **More about Cohen #278**
Date: 7/4/98 12:32:27 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Ron:

In response to your request for input on measuring rotation, I think there is a lesson to be learned from our misunderstanding. My suggestion would be to add a table showing for each variety where the obverse 6 o'clock mark intersects the date. Certainly this would add an element of complexity, but when combined with the instructions for the location of the 12 o'clock mark it would give a consistent and inflexible position of the coin and ensure that all measurements were made in a uniform manner.

I have continued to examine Cohen #278, and have showed it to Eric Newman, along with your original e-mail about it. We can see no evidence of an alteration, even under 10X magnification. The color and surfaces appear totally natural, as does the edge where repair might have taken place.

Whether the die state is late or early is not clear to me. The coin is slightly off-center toward the top on the reverse. In fact, several letters of STATES actually touch the rim. This could account for a greater amount of denticles showing at the bottom, since they would be slightly moved toward the center of the coin and away from the rim. I have seen particularly strong denticles in the same location on other off-center half cents. The strong ribbon might result from this, as well, although that is less clear to me. There is absolutely no trace of the lump under A, and the wear on other devices in this somewhat protected area does not seem to indicate that it would have worn off if it was present at the time of the striking.

Eric believes the so-called cuds were present when the coin left the dies. He is not familiar enough with the die states to dispute your conclusion that they could not have been created by a broken die. He offered an alternate hypothesis of a defective planchet, light in weight with some of the left-over metal originally raised well above the normal surface. This metal would have been pressed down onto the planchet, either during the process of upsetting the rim or during the striking of the coin. He gave me a description of the claw which was used to pull the hot strip through the rollers, and which might in some way have created a defective spot on the strip, which later remained on the planchet.

Neither of your explanations nor any of ours satisfactorily accounts for the substantial lightness in weight.

Bottom line: Truly a mystery coin at this time. Needs further examination by a number of us for other opinions. A project for EAC 99! You are totally justified in casting serious doubt on it as a die state in anything you write. However, a conclusion that it is an alteration or any other specific answer as to what it is seems much less warranted than a conclusion as to what it is not.

Hope all this is helpful to you.

Regards, Tett

19A

Subj: **Re: More about Cohen #278**
Date: 7/8/98 12:03:26 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
Reply-to: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Tett,

I initially considered your idea for a table of key obverse positions for measuring reverse rotations was overkill. However, after more thought, I now think it is a good idea and would be a useful addition. Thanks for the idea.

I still believe Cohen:278 is an early die state coin. However, perhaps it would better be described as an "anomalous" EDS coin rather than an "altered" one. Bob Grellman has suggested that the "cuds" (and the coin's low weight) may have been the result of laminations.

Bob would like to examine Cohen:278 along with examples of EDS and LDS 1809 C-5 specimens. He feels certain that he can determine the true nature of the coin from such a comparison. If you will mail Bob the Cohen:278 I will send him both EDS and LDS examples for comparison. I trust Bob's judgement and will abide with Bob's findings regarding any forthcoming publications regarding Cohen:278. If you would like Bob's address, it is: J. R. "Bob" Grellman, Jr., P.O. Box 951988, Lake Mary, FL 32795-1988. His phone number is [REDACTED]. Let me know what you decide.

Ron

19B

Subj: **Re: More about Cohen #278**
Date: 7/8/98 1:03:18 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Ron

Grellman is a great idea. I will send it tg him.

Tett



11 June '98

REGAL UNIVERSITY HOTEL
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA

Tett,

On the obverse side, the head of Liberty should be fully vertical.

For pre-1809 half cents, this usually centers the "E" of LIBERTY at top and the "date" at bottom. For "Classic Heads", the date is often off-center, so just keep Liberty's head vertical.

Clock rotation on the reverse can be estimated for pre-1809 dates between the tops of the two wreath branches. For Classic Heads, I use the position of the highest berry.

An estimated rotation halfway between 11 and 12 is "11:30". This is the usual value for 1804 C-6's. (You can use this as a test example). Each 1 hr of rotation = 30° rotation. Example:
 $11:30 = 15^\circ$ CCW (counter clock-wise).

A REGAL INTERNATIONAL HOTEL

PH 919.282.8575 • FAX 919.282.8195 • 100 Riverside Resort • 800.222.8888

<http://www.regalhotels.com/durham>



11 June '98

REGAL UNIVERSITY HOTEL
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA

Tett,

On the obverse side, the head of Liberty should be fully vertical. For pre-1809 half cents, this usually centers the "E" of LIBERTY at top and the "date" at bottom. For "Classic Heads", the date is often off-center, so just keep Liberty's head vertical.

Clock rotation on the reverse can be estimated for pre-1809 dates between the tops of the two wreath branches. For Classic Heads, I use the position of the highest berry.

An estimated rotation halfway between 11 and 12 is "11:30". This is the usual value for 1804 C-6's. (You can use this as a test example). Each 1 hr of rotation = 30° rotation. Example:
 $11:30 = 15^\circ$ CCW (counter clock-wise).

A REGAL INTERNATIONAL HOTEL

Phone 919.383.8575 • Fax 919.383.8495 • REGAL INN RESERVATIONS 800.222.8888

<http://www.regalhotels.com/durham>

John

REVERSE



Note: Coin should be centered
within clear circle.

OBVERSE

LIBERTY



DATE

Example: 1804 C-6 \approx 11:30

THOUGHTS ON THIN PLANCHET LETTERED EDGE HALF CENTS

Ron Manley

In his March P-W article "Three New Subvarieties of Half Cents? A Speculation", R. Tettenhorst listed ten specimens of thin planchet lettered edge (TPLE) half cents. These have the same die combinations as the varieties 1794 C-9 (3), 1795 C-1 (4), and 1795 C-2a (3). Tett questioned whether these coins should be considered errors, trial pieces, or something else. I found Tett's article very well-written, intriguing, and most enjoyable. However, I am not yet convinced that these pieces are trial pieces or patterns.

One of the ten specimens was known to Cohen and Breen when their respective books were published—the light-weight 1795 C-1 Brobston-Cohen coin. Both authors considered it simply an error—a detail pointed out by Tett in his recent article. In 1989, Bill Weber described two TPLE "1795 C-2a" specimens in his May P-W article "Sinking the Subs (Subvarieties)". These may possibly be two of the three specimens known to Tett. In this 1989 article, Bill had proposed that the TPLE "1795 C-2a" specimens known to him satisfied "all variety criteria" for a new variety.

Tett wrote that he had developed suspicions over a 15 year period that these TPLE half cents were not simply errors but, possibly, "trial pieces intended to determine an appropriate weight for the newly authorized lighter weight half cents". Whereas it is true that the TPLE half cents listed by Tett are only from the three varieties minted immediately before 1795 C-2b (the first plain edge variety minted at the standard weight of 34 grains), it should be noted that 1794 C-9, 1795 C-1, and 1795 C-2a are all fairly *common* varieties.

This observation is important if TPLE half cents are simple errors. Consider the possibility that a few thin planchets were randomly mixed in with the regular planchets used to mint 1795 C-1, 1795 C-2a, and the last 1794 varieties. Then, the proportion of TPLE specimens to total specimens minted should be approximately constant for each variety. For example, if there were five 1794 C-9 specimens for every 1794 C-8 specimen struck, there should have been about five TPLE 1794 C-9 specimens for every TPLE 1794 C-8 specimen. *Could this be why TPLE specimens of rare 1794 varieties have not yet been found?*

Three of the ten TPLE half cents listed by Tett weighed from 90 to 95.7 grains. If you think these are trial pieces or pattern coins, consider the following half cents from the 1992 Cohen sale: lot 9 (1794 C-1b, wt. 89.97 grains), lot 10 (1794 C-2a, wt. 94.91 grains), lot 19 (1794 C-3b, wt. 95.37 grains), lot 20 (1794 C-4a, wt. 94.14 grains), lot 29 (1794 C-6a, wt. 93.21 grains), lot 34 (1794 C-8, wt. 93.98 grains). Examples are not limited to this sale. Consider lot 1 (1793 C-1, wt. 95.1 grains), lot 2 (1793 C-2, wt. 95.4 grains), lot 8 (1794 C-6a, wt. 95.5 grains), lot 9 (1794 C-3a, wt. 91.5 grains), and lot 12 (1794 C-8, wt. 92.7 grains) from the 1994 Wally Gilligan sale. What about lot 3 (1793 C-3, wt. 95.1 grains) from the 1987 Norweb sale or lot 398 (1794 C-5a, wt. 95.8 grains) from the 1996 Eliasberg sale?

Lettered edge half cents dated 1794 and 1795 are found not only light weight, but much heavier than the official weight of 104 grains. Take for example lot 13 (1794 C-2b, wt. 112.19 grains) and lot 41 (1795 C-1, wt. 118.83) from the Cohen sale, lot 14 (1795 C-1, wt. 111.7 grains) from the Gilligan sale, lot 14 (1795 C-1, wt. 109.4 grains) from the Norweb sale, or lot 401 (1795 C-1, wt. 116.1 grains) from the Eliasberg sale. I feel certain that many additional heavy weight specimens will turn up, if collectors would only look.

Note that I have listed four *extra-thick planchet* examples of 1795 C-1, one of the three varieties Tett described with thin planchet specimens. What is this telling us? Tett's explanation does not explain why the weights of 1795 C-1 half cents vary all over the place. Perhaps, there is another explanation than the one Tett proposed. In his half cent book's section on 1795 lettered edge half cents, Breen described severe problems around this time with the rolling mills responsible for turning copper ingots into copper strip the "thickness of finished coins". He wrote that these rolling mills "broke down repeatedly, causing more interruptions of coinage even than die breakage". *Could this be the explanation for both thin planchet and extra-thick planchet 1795 lettered edge half cents?*

I have given in the above paragraphs my reasons why I consider it premature to elevate the status of Tett's TPLE half cents beyond the level of errors. We simply need more data on early half cent weights. However, I have included mention of Tett's discovery in my book's manuscript because these half cents are noteworthy in and of themselves, and because of the real *possibility* that they may be trial pieces, as Tett has speculated.

9

Subject: Reply to data
Date: 6/23/98 4:56:01 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
Reply-to: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Greetings Tett,

Several things. First, my mailing address for the Craig Sholley correspondence is: Ron Manley, 114 Polo Drive, Salisbury, NC 28144. My phone number FYI is (704) 638-0747. Thanks again for the reverse rotation data. It was very helpful.

I have some unfortunate news: I have concluded that Cohen:278 (your 1809 C-5 coin with the apparent obverse cuds) must be an altered early die state coin. I discussed this on the phone this A.M. with Bob Grellman who is editing my book manuscript. Therefore, I will not list this coin as a unique example of the "terminal" die state. My reasons for this conclusion are summarized as follows: (1) It is extremely improbable that a die would break simultaneously forming two large cuds and a smaller one without pre-existing cracks in the areas of the breaks. (2) The coin's weight is suspiciously low: 72.84 grains rather than about 84 grains. (3) The coin's reverse (as seen from the Cohen sale plate and photos by Frank Wilkinson) shows the lower ribbon at 6:00 to be well-struck. Dentilation is evident from about 4:30 to 9:00. True LDS 1809 C-5 specimens are from heavily lapped dies and, as a result, the lower ribbon is very weak even on uncirculated specimens. Lapping also removes most of the dentilation. Typical high grade LDS specimens have dentilation on the reverse only from about 5:30 to 8:00. (4) You reported your coin with a normal 12:00 reverse alignment. This is the same as found for EDS 1809 C-5 specimens. LDS 1809 C-5 specimens with lapped dies are found with a CW-rotated reverse around 12:45.

Bob Grellman said I should mention why I am omitting this 1809 C-5's "die state" from my book so that readers will know that it's not an oversight. I would like to write up my comments about this coin for Penny-Wise but I will do so ONLY if you give me your permission to do so.

If you are not too upset with me, I'd like your assistance once again. Briefly, I was quite surprised that the "gripped edge" 1797 C-3c half cents in your collection have a different rotation from that of "plain edge" and "lettered edge" 1797 C-3 coins. Perhaps, this is due to different die states for the "gripped edge" coins. You reported three "gripped edge" coins all rotated CW about 12:15. I am aware of plain and lettered edge coins ONLY having a CCW rotation of about 11:30. Tett, could you check your 1797 C-3a and C-3b specimens to see if any of them share the same rotation as you reported for 1797 C-3c? This is a real mystery to me at this point.

Finally, regarding the issue of the status of thin planchet lettered edge half cents. I am not currently aware of 1793-1794 lettered edge specimens (other than the six you reported) within the weight range of 80 to 89 grains. If you have access to a scale or balance, it would be great if you could take it to the next EAC convention to weigh early half cents. If a notice is placed in the P-W before the convention there might be dozens or

1804 C 7

- 1 209 unattributed 3/72
- 2 1011 Showers
- 3 " Showers
- 4 1018 } WK Raymond 9/76
- 5 " } ex-Baraford?
- 6 1201 } JR McG 6/81
- 7 1529 } Superior Robinson Sale #1934 1/89
Ex EAC #83 #157
- 8 1730 Cohen # 175
- 9 " " # 176

Subj: **Re: Cohen #278**
Date: 7/29/98 5:07:38 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
Reply-to: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Hi Tett,

Just curious about your reaction to Bob Grellman's findings/comments about Cohen:278. The anomalous "cuds" certainly appear to be a mystery. I still plan an article for P-W. If I choose, may I refer to Eric Newman's hypothesis that you referred to in an earlier e-mail?

Best,

Ron

Subj: **Re: Cohen #278**

Date: 7/29/98 5:57:56 PM Central Daylight Time

From: [REDACTED]

To: [REDACTED]

Hi Ron:

In general, I was pleased that he agreed there was no sign of alteration. His confirmation of your attribution as an early die state was also no surprise, since I had already been persuaded by your thorough analysis. His conclusion that it was a mystery coin matched my own.

Current best guess, quite willing to be revised with further observations from someone: A defective planchet with extra metal for some unexplained reason. But I'm not sure how the adjacent striking was as detailed as we see it if these blobs were there at the time of striking. Still a mystery!

Tett

MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Subj: Re: 1855 C1
Date: 11/22/2001 11:25:08 AM Central Standard Time
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Ron: I have now had an opportunity to look carefully at my 1855's. These include three unquestioned, well-pedigreed proofs, and several uncirculated examples.

The proofs, in fact, do not have perfect denticles completely around both sides, but their denticles are clearly stronger than those of the uncs, with one exception. Most of the uncs, even those with full red, have denticles that range from mediocre to mushy to missing.

The exception, obtained from Jim McGuigan in 1982, is an example described as, "Uncirculated, early strike with full denticles." It has denticles entirely around both sides, with slightly weaker areas quite comparable to those on the proofs. It also has a partial wire rim like the proofs. The surfaces are somewhat reflective, but nothing approaching those of the proofs, which appear to have been struck on highly polished planchets.

There are some other differences in striking between the proofs and the early strike. In the proofs the raised arms of all the stars come to a crisp, sharp, high ridge. This is noticeably not uniformly true in the early strike, although its stars appear to be much more defined than those in the picture of your coin. Similarly, the central areas of the high leaves are clearly more defined on the proofs.

On balance, it would seem that your example is an early circulation strike rather than a circulated proof. This is based on examination of only a few specimens and a picture of your coin. If it is any consolation, the early strike may be as rare as the proofs.

You might ask Jim if he remembers the coin he traded to me, and what his opinion of your coin is in comparison. If you would like, I can bring several of my coins to EAC. Hope this helps.

Happy Thanksgiving,

Tett



Subj: **1855 C1**
Date: 11/9/2001 2:51:59 PM Central Standard Time
From: [REDACTED]
Reply-to: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
File: **1855C1CirculatedProof.jpg** (41131 bytes) DL Time (TCP/IP): < 1 minute

Greetings:

I recently purchased an 1855 C1 half cent that I think is quite likely a circulated proof or possibly a VEDS proof-like business strike. Photos are attached.

I'd like each of your expert opinions as to the coin's status. As you can see, it has full obverse and reverse dentilation. To my knowledge, only 1855 proofs have been seen with this feature. Since circulated proofs are known to exist for all proof-only half cent dates, I reasoned years ago that a few circulated proof 1855s should exist. I'm sure I've looked at several hundred specimens and this is the first (and only) specimen that looked promising.

It is a nice even brown and weighs 85.1 grains (FWIW, the Eliasberg 1855 proof weighed 85.0 grains). The faint obverse striations that Breen mentioned are not visible but I wouldn't expect to see them due to the coin's wear. However, to my eyes, the surfaces appear distinctly proof-like when the half cent is viewed in natural sunlight. Both of the Mint State coins in my collection are very slightly rotated CW. This coin is perfectly aligned with absolutely no reverse rotation.

Thanks for looking!

Ron Manley

Subj: Edges
Date: 4/4/00 12:31:05 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Ron,

I was delighted to read your article on edge blunders. As usual, you are out front publishing interesting new information on half cents. Also as usual, I am glad to help in any way I can.

You asked for information about additional specimens. I bought the Kermit Smyth specimen from him. His return address sticker did not include an e on the end of his name.

Additional specimens I own:

- 1793 C1 Reads "FOR A DO WO HUNDRED.." This came from Bob Grellman's Mail Bid Sale #2, in June, 1994. It is NOT a double struck edge as described in the catalogue, just misaligned edge lettering devices.
- 1794 C1 Unlettered edge. Different from the one you list, since I acquired it in 1992 from Bill Weber.
- 1794 C2 Unlettered edge. Different from the one you list, ssince I acquired it in the February 1992 Bowers and Merena Witham and Sansoucy Sale, lot #1.
- 1794 C4 There is a lot going on for this coin ! To begin with, the edge lettering reads, "TWO HUNDRED FOR A DOLLAR," but there is a second "HUN" struck over "LAR". There is an unusually wide space between "HUNDRED" and "FOR", and relatively little space between the overstruck "LAR" and "TWO". Moreover someone long ago counterstamped this otherwise clean VF 1794 with the numerals "1854" directly over the date. Perhaps a happily married man made a token for his wife on their 60th wedding anniversary. Finally, there is a counterstamp on the edge in the narrow space between the overstruck "LAR" and "FOR" which appears to have been made with the same punch used for the "1" in the counterstamped date. An aggressive auction cataloguer might make a big deal out of the "uniqueness" of this specimen. Acquired from Wally Lee in 1986.
- 1794 C9 Unlettered edge. Acquired from Julian Leidman in 1987.
- 1794 C9 Unlettered edge. Acquired this past February.

Ron, it seems to me that I have missed or passed up several additional examples, usually priced at a very high level because the seller had an exaggerated idea of the rarity and value. I didn't keep records of these, and some may well be among the specimens you list. Since many collectors and dealers don't examine the edges very carefully, it would seem probable that a good number of blundered edges are out there unrecognized. I hope your article and subsequent updates will begin to correct this. Purely as a hunch, considering the frequency with which specimens have turned up in recent years, it would not surprise me if 30 - 50 eventually are recognized.

By the way, if any of those you list or other specimens are available for sale, I would be delighted to have an opportunity to add them to my error collection.

Hope you get to receive this before EAC 2000. Looking forward to seeing you there.

Regards, Tett

Subj: **Re: 1793 half cents**
 Date: **10/21/2002 11:21:51 AM Central Daylight Time**
 From: [REDACTED]
 To: [REDACTED]

Sent from the Internet (Details)

Rick, I do not believe the emission sequence revision you have suggested is correct. However, I am quite intrigued by the 1793 C4, State 3.0 that you have described and would like to see an original photo (no images were visible in the separate attachment you sent me over the weekend).

In 1793, there were only 35,334 half cents struck. These were delivered as follows: 7,000 on July 20th, 24,934 on July 26th, and the last 3,400 on September 18th. In 1793, the Mint was fully capable of striking 13,000 half cents per day. Thus, the July 20th delivery represents only one day's work (and not even a full one at that) and the July 26th delivery two days work. Since there are four 1793 die varieties that survive in roughly equal numbers, each variety's mintage was about 8,800 pieces. Thus, it is "logical" that only a single set of dies were used for the July 20th delivery. Back then, dies were usually taken out of press only if they totally failed (like the C1 reverse) OR if striking occurred on multiple days. Clearly, NEITHER of these events occurred with what you call "First use" of the 1793 C2 obverse. In fact, nothing dramatic happened to it (i.e., severe clashing, rust, etc.). The plated photos in Cohen's 2nd edition are totally unconvincing to my eyes for putting the earliest C2s before C1. (If anything, that coin's obverse looks later than C1 to me). Yes, I know you own it and that you can see repunching inside the loop of its 9. As it is a high grade coin, that does not surprise me at all. I think it much more likely that the C1/2 obverse was lightly repolished before its reuse for the C2 mintage (delivered on July 26th). As for the chin defect you refer to, this isn't clearly evident from photos—even of high grade survivors. In other words, C1 specimens may or may not show it. Is this the same chin "defect" that appears to be seen on the 3-inch plate coin for 1793 C1 in my book?

As for the 1793 C4 you report with a reverse cud over A in STATES, I think that is quite possible, as breaks could and did happen spontaneously on early dies (as happened on the C1 reverse after a similar number of strikes). As I think I mentioned during your recent phone call, I have a hazy recollection of seeing a couple of C4s before C1. (If anything, that coin's obverse looks later than C1 to me). I was unable to confirm them when working on my book and thus didn't list the die state. I'll need to look again when I have time. The Mint delivery records suggest that the last of the C4 mintage was struck much later than the first part (September 18th vs. late July). If confirmed, State 3.0 C4 specimens were almost certainly among those struck in mid-September. As they would have been a separate striking, any State 3.0 specimens would likely also have a different reverse rotation. This is something to look for. Lastly, you need to include a high quality blowup of the State 3.0 C4 to illustrate your PW article.

Best regards to all,
 Ron Manley

P.S. As a minor point, on most C1 survivors HALF CENT is NOT "clear" at all. The words were weakly punched in the first place and it doesn't bother me at all that you omitted my State 2.0 for the variety in your write-up. I probably would have done the same if I were writing my book today.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Richard Coleman" <[REDACTED]>
 To: <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Monday, October 21, 2002 9:18 AM
 Subject: 1793 half cents

> Hi Folks,

>

> I have been whiling away the hours by comparing photos, coins and
 > descriptions of 1793 half cents. The results are contained in the attached

- > table. I would appreciate any comments, criticism, etc. before I had
- > verbage and send it to Harry.
- >
- > Two questions remains unanswered. Has anyone seen a 1793 C-3 with or a 1793
- > C-4 without the clash marks between the hair and cap?
- >
- > Thanks.
- >
- > Hope to see some of you in Baltimore.
- >
- > Rick Coleman
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- > Unlimited Internet access – and 2 months free! Try MSN.
- > <http://resourcecenter.msn.com/access/plans/2monthsfree.asp>
- >

3.1 No. Green color plate for 93 Mint
 3.2 No Mint state Col. Green coin
 3.3 No G rough 1/5 RC
 4.1 Yes M/S Showers – faint
 4.2 Can't tell EF planchet/flake RC sale #6

Subj: **Re: 1804 C2**
Date: 2/15/2003 1:49:08 PM Central Standard Time
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Sent from the Internet ([Details](#))

Hi Tett,

It's impossible to say, considering the extreme rarity of this die state (and the fact that practically all specimens of the variety are very worn). I do think it is likely that all State 2.0 specimens are the results of retained cuds. Any variations in appearance are probably due only to shifting of the broken die piece relative to the rest of the die.

Take care,
Ron

----- Original Message -----

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, February 15, 2003 12:22 PM
Subject: 1804 C2

Ron: I have a question about your die state 2.0 of the 1804 C2. The specimen that I have is the one from Roger's sale, lot 140. The area above the obverse crack is slightly lower than the rest of the field, as described in the catalogue. This certainly seems to me to be consistent with Mike Packard's description of it as being the result of a "retained cud" where the piece had broken loose from the die, but not yet fallen out altogether. Is this typical of all of the state 2.0 specimens, or is it a slightly later state of damage to the die ? I have not seen any other examples of state 2.0, and thought you could help me. Thanks very much, Tett

Main Identity

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 28, 2003 2:32 PM
Subject: Re: 1803 C2

Ron: That is very nice of you. Make out the check to R. Tettenhorst,
220 N. 4th St. Suite A
St. Louis, MO 63102

We are going away for a few weeks, so I may not get the coin from the bank until late in May. If this is not ok let me know. It was good seeing you and the others at EAC. Regards, Tett

*Whenever it's convenient for you is ok with
me,*

Thanks again!

Don Manley

Dear Ron

Here is the information on my nine specimens, sometimes a bit more than you asked for.

A State I. Cohen Sale lot 175. In my opinion, grades a full 12, although catalogued in the sale as a 10. Roger considered it a 12, and it sold for a bit over the CQR price for a choice 12.

B State I or II, probably II. The coin is weakly struck in this area, so detail is faint or missing. ~~Grade was not 15 with~~ The strike is much stronger on the obverse. Grade a net 15 after some deduction for the reverse weakness, which some purists might say should not affect the grade. I disagree. Interestingly this was graded BU by the dealer from whom I purchased it 25 years ago. He was a non-copper (non-competent, non-honest dealer). However, since the coin was not attributed ^{by variety} except as a spiked chin, and priced at \$80, I let him deceive me as to condition.

C State II. Cohen Sale Lot 176. Catalogue grade of 15 seems about right to me by current EAC standards, although Roger considered it a 30. In the sale, however, it sold for about 25% over the CQR price for a choice 20.

- D State III + The additional crack is present through AME. I can't see it reaching R. This is listed in Breen as State II, so take his listings with an element of skepticism. His memory of die states of coins he had seen was sometimes faulty! This is a coin from the Showers Collection, mentioned near the end of Breen's listing at the top of p. 238. Interestingly, when Jon Hanson prepared the envelopes for the Showers Collection, he called it a VF30, without deduction for the obverse marks. Years later, for the Breen census, which Jon prepared, he quite accurately remembered and described the marks. I grade the coin a net 15.
- E State IV From Superiors Jack Robinson Sale of January 1989, lot 1934. Formerly EAC 83 lot 151. Listed as Good 4 in the catalogue, but I consider it AG-3.
- F State VI The better of the two Showers coins. Listed in Breen at the middle of the right column of p. 237. Inaccurately listed there as State II, so again beware. Graded as 30+ by Hanson in the Showers listing. I consider it a straight 30.

G State VI Grade 20

H State VIII Ron, I'm a bit confused by your description of state VIII. How does this second cud touching top of F differ from the cud first described as state VI? In any case, this coin exactly matches the ~~state~~ illustration in Breen ~~for~~ state VII and that in Cohen's second edition as "intermediate die state." Grade is Fine 12.

I State VIII The cud extends from the top of O in OF to the top of R in AMERICA to the rim ~~of~~ over I, No cud over TES, although there is a crack from the rim through the upper left serif of T to a point just above the bottom of the T and then through the bottom of E to the lower left corner of S. This cud ~~is~~ exactly matches the illustration in Breen for state VIII and that in Cohen for "late die state." Ron, since your listing doesn't mention this cud over AMER, you may want to contact those who have listed coins as state VIII to see if they have it. If not, ~~they~~ they are really VIII's, aren't they?

FF Hope this is helpful. Will respond as to
1831's in due course, later rather than sooner

Regards,

Tett

cc EAC¹⁸⁷ file

Ron Manley
114 Polo Drive
Salisbury, NC 28144

R. TETTENHORST
P. O. Box 14020
Saint Louis, Missouri 63178

July 18, 1996

Mr. Ron Manley
114 Polo Drive
Salisbury, NC 28144

Dear Ron:

I would be happy to participate in your study. I have a number of specimens of the 1804 C7. It will be a little while before I can get to this project, since I have already promised some other people to help them with projects they are working on. Will it mess up your timetable if I don't get my list to you until around Labor Day?

Also, what is the fascination that Polo Drive holds for you Tarheels? My son, who is a graduate of UNC at Chapel Hill, lives on Polo Drive in St. Louis!

Sincerely,

R. Tettenhorst

mb

Peter:

Dept. of CANS
(Coincidences of Absolutely No Significance)

Ron Manley
114 Polo Drive
Salisbury, NC 28144

July 23, 1996

R. Tettenhorst
P.O. Box 14020
St. Louis, MO 63178

Dear Tett:

Thank you for your willingness to respond to my study of 1804 C7 half cents. Around Labor Day would be perfectly fine. To help me avoid duplication, could you indicate whether any of your specimens are Breen Plate coins, listed in his CC, or are from the JHR, Cohen, or Gilligan sales.

If I might indulge upon you once more, would you mind also taking a look at your 1831 original half cent specimens? If you could refer to the end of my May P-W article, I could really use the die rotations for your three coins. If you have any comments on the 1831 proofs v. business strikes controversy I would be pleased to have them.

Regarding the fascination that Polo Drive holds for us Tarheels, you might ask your son. I think it's just a nice place to live. By the way, I've never really considered myself a Tarheel since I transplanted here from South Carolina, to SC from upstate New York, and grew up in Louisiana. I did, however, meet my wife here 20 years ago while at Duke University. Just between you and me, I like UNC-Chapel Hill better. Again, my thanks.

Best regards,



Ron Manley

1804 C7

- 1 VF30 State 0 Slight doubling
- 2 VF20+ State 1 Very thin planchet ex Showers
- 3 VF35 State 3 and not to 0 "
- 4 VF25 " 3
- 5 VF20 " 3+ and to 0
- 6 G5 " 4
- 7 G4 " IV
- 8 VG10 State I Better than .1 clearly State I Ex Cohen Sale lot 175
- 9 F15 State II ← RT → Earlier than .2 " lot 176

R. TETTENHORST
P. O. Box 14020
Saint Louis, Missouri 63178

August 8, 1996

Mr. Ron Manley
114 Polo Drive
Salisbury, NC 28144

Dear Ron:

Here is the information on my nine specimens, sometimes a bit more than you asked for.

- A State I. Cohen Sale Lot 175. In my opinion, grades a full 12, although catalogues in the sale as a 10. Roger considered it a 12, and it sold for a bit over the QQR price for a choice 12.
- B State I or II, probably II. The coin is weakly struck in this area, so detail is faint or missing. The strike is much stronger on the obverse. Grade a net 15 after some deduction for the reverse weakness, which some purists might say should not affect the grade. I disagree. Interestingly, this was graded BU by the dealer from whom I purchased it twenty-five years ago. He was a non-copper (non-competent, non-honest dealer). However, since the coin was not attributed by variety except as a spiked chin, and priced at \$80, I let him deceive me as to condition.
- C State II. Cohen Sale Lot 176. Catalogue grade of 15 seems about right to me by current EAC standards, although Roger considered it a 30. In the sale, however, it sold for about 25 percent over the QQR price for a choice 20.
- D State III. The additional crack is present through AME. I can't see it reaching R. This is listed in Breen as state II, so take his listings with an element of skepticism. His memory of die states of coins he had seen was sometimes faulty! This is a coin from the Showers' Collection, mentioned near the end of Breen's listing at the top of page 238. Interestingly, when Jon Hanson prepared the envelopes for the Showers' Collection, he called it a VF30, without deduction for the obverse marks. Years later, for the Breen census, which Jon prepared, he quite accurately remembered and described the marks. I grade the coin a net 15.
- E State IV. From Superior's Jack Robinson Sale of January 1989, Lot 1934. Formerly EAC 83 Lot 151. Listed as Good 4 in the catalogue, but I consider it AG3.
- F State VI. The better of the two Showers' coins. Listed in Breen at the middle of the right column of page 237. Inaccurately listed there as State IV, so again beware. Graded as 30+ by Hanson in the Showers' listing. I consider it a straight 30.

G State VI. Grade 20.

H State VII. Ron, I am a bit confused by your description of state VIII. How does this second cud touching top of F differ from the cud first described as state VI? In any case, this coin exactly matches the illustration in Breen for state VII, and that in Cohen's second edition as "intermediate die state." Grade is Fine 12.

I State VIII. The cud extends from the top of O in OF to the top of R in AMERICA to the rim over I. No cud over TES, although there is a crack from the rim through the upper left serif of T to a point just above the bottom of the T and then through the bottom of E to the lower left corner of S. This cud exactly matches this illustration in Breen for state VIII and that in Cohen for "late die state." Ron, since your listing doesn't mention this cud over AMER, you may want to contact those who have listed coins as state VIII to see if they have it. If not, they are really VII's, aren't they?

Ron, there is one additional observation I would like to make regarding a rarity survey of die states. The least valid information for this purpose will come from those who collect the variety by die state. This is because they will probably have a specimen of some of the rarer die states, but they will also stop with a single specimen of the common die states. Their collections will thus substantially understate the rarity of the rarer varieties and overstate the rarity of the common varieties. Much more useful information will come from collectors who have only a single specimen of this variety. These could be people who collect half cents by variety only without regard to die states, or collectors who have only "major" varieties with a C7 representing a spiked chin. It could even include a few date collectors.

For example, if 75 percent of the coins owned by this universe of single-specimen collectors are from the two most common die states, and none are from the two rarest die states, that is a pretty reliable indication of relative rarity. However, a die-state collector might very well have one specimen of each variety, which would be totally misleading. Therefore, I would suggest that you make a strong effort to get information from people who have only a single specimen, perhaps by asking through Penny-Wise or one-on-one solicitation of half cent collectors who do not happen to be in the 1/200 Survey.

Hope this is helpful. Will respond as to 1831's in due course, later rather than sooner.

Sincerely,

R. Tettenhorst

mb

FOL 10-1
(see 8-8 R.T.
ettler)

Ron Manley
114 Polo Drive
Salisbury, NC 28144

August 13, 1996

Mr. R. Tettenhorst
P. O. Box 14020
St. Louis, MO 63178

Dear Tett,

Thank you for the detailed descriptions of your 1804 C7 specimens. Tett, also thank you for finding in your point H my typographical error for Breen State VIII in my Survey Form! For the Form, I meant to use Breen's die state descriptions, not mine. Somehow, I repeated State VI's description for State VIII. I'm rather embarrassed--I had proofread it at least three times, but evidently not as closely as I had thought. I'm usually much more careful.

In the confusion I inadvertently created over State VIII, you omitted the grade of your State VIII coin (your point I). Can you recall what its grade is?

Good 4

Tett, I think it would be useful to correct the omissions and outright errors in die states that appear in Breen's Condition Census for the variety. There are a number of them. May I have your permission to correct your listings in my article? These would be as follows:

Certainly!

Philip M. Showers collection [Stack's, privately in 1969] to Willis I. duPont; now in a Missouri cabinet. State VI. **Very Fine**

The Philip M. Showers-Willis I. duPont-Missouri cabinet specimen.[State III].

I do plan to have a Request for Data in the next P-W for any 1804 C-7 owners I may not have contacted. My goal is to contact as many collectors as possible. As of today's date, I have die state data on 91 specimens and I'm aware of an additional 18 specimens with unknown die states. Undoubtedly, there are a few more. A significant amount of correspondence has been to eliminate possible duplications and to investigate possible new intermediate states.

Tett, thank you for your data and your advice. You have been very helpful! My sincere gratitude.

Glad to help on such a fine project!

Best regards,

Rm

Ron Manley

Tett

8-20-96

Subj: Re: Your article in P-W
Date: 98-03-26 18:19:51 EST
From: rmanley@salisbury.net (rmanley)
Reply-to: rmanley@salisbury.net
To: halfcent@aol.com

Dear Tett:

I received P-W in the mail today and just finished reading your thought-provoking article. I wanted to offer the following comments and observations in response. In your request for info and opinions, number 1 you ask for additional info about thin planchet lettered edge half cents of 1794 and 1795. Using the weight range you provided for the 10 specimens in your article (77.3 - 95.7 grains) as a guideline, I note the following specimens: 1794 C-1b VG 89.97 gr (Cohen:9)

1794 C-3a G 91.5 gr (B&M

5/94:9--the W. Gilligan sale)

1794 C-4a VF 94.14 gr (Cohen:29)

1794 C-5a F 95.8 gr

(Eliasberg:398)

1794 C-6a G 93.98 gr (Cohen:34)

1794 C-6a AG 95.5 gr (B&M 5/94:8)

1794 C-8 VG 92.7 gr (B&M 5/94:12)

1794 C-8 VG 93.98 gr (Cohen:34)

While I'm at it, please note the following low weights I observed for a few 1793 half cents!

1793 C-1 AG 95.1 gr (B&M 5/94:1)

1793 C-2 VG 95.4 gr (B&M 5/94:2)

1793 C-3 AG 95.8 gr (B&M 5/94:3)

1793 C-3 VF 95.1 gr (Norweb:3)

And still, at the opposite end of the weight spectrum, I note:

1793 C-1 AU 111.2 gr (Norweb:1)

1794 C-4b VG 109.88 gr (Cohen:25)

1794 C-9 VF 111.26 gr (Cohen:36)

1795 C-1 VF 109.4 gr (Norweb:14)

1795 C-1 G 111.7 gr (B&M 5/94:14)

1795 C-1 MS 116.3 gr

(Eliasberg:401)

1795 C-1 VG 118.83 gr (Cohen:41)

The above weights were taken from a mere four sources. The wide variability in weights that we have noted (please see my article in P-W, same issue) do NOT (in my humble opinion) suggest that additional subvarieties should be added to the half cent literature.

Nonetheless, your arguments in favor of light weight lettered edge trial pieces made a lot of sense. But where should we draw the line for such pieces? If we arbitrarily choose 89 grains maximum weight, then 7 of your 10 examples (and none of mine) would still be valid. Unfortunately, the data base on half cent weights is currently much too small (again, in my opinion) to support your conclusions. Your solicitation of additional data is an excellent step in the right direction. I truly wish that ALL major copper sales would provide specimen weights for reference.

On a related note, you mention (twice, I believe) Breen's listing as subvarieties the 1856 copper-nickel "patterns" B-2b and B-2c. I described my thoughts on this issue recently by e-mail to Rick Coleman. My view is that 1856 B-2b should be DELISTED as indistinguishable from B-2c. Of the 3 specimens of B-2b in Breen's Proof Census, the Norweb specimen (B&M 10/87:138) was described when sold as "we are not aware that any specific metallic analysis has ever been made of this coin", weight 70.8 grains (Breen's weight range for B-2b was given as 69.4 to 70.3 grains). The Anderson-Dupont coin (lot 1157) was described in its sale as 90% copper-10% nickel, but without supporting documentation. Earlier in the A-D sale, lot 1155 was described as a semi-unique 1854 proof, struck in copper-nickel, well-struck, but weighing 84 grains!

While I'm on this subject, 1856 B-2c is listed in Breen's half cent Encyclopedia as having a standard weight of 72 grains and in his Complete Encyclopedia of U.S. and Colonial Coins as having an observed weight range of 70.98 to 73 grains. However, specimens such as Norweb:139 (wt. 69.8 gr), Cohen:379 (wt. 69.9 gr), and Eliasberg:110 (wt. 70.5 gr) ALL fall outside Breen's dubious weight range. I'll let you draw your own conclusions.

As you may be aware, I have been writing a new reference book on the die states of business strike half cents. If you'd like to talk more, I'll be at EAC '98 next week in Boston. See you there!

Best regards,

Ron Manley
rmanley@salisbury.net

Subj: Re: Your article in P-W
Date: 98-03-26 19:39:47 EST
From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Ron

Great input! Thanks very much. I found your article on weights very interesting and an important contribution. Quite a coincidence that both articles appeared at the same time.

See you in Boston and we can talk more about both subjects.

Tett

03/16/98 10:07 EST <http://www.pmewswire.com>

SU: PDT

IN: REA

ST: Missouri

Ron Manley rotation

1794 2B 12:30 (12:20) Date at 7.9
↑

3B 12:30 (12:20) Date at 9.4
↑

6B 12:05 " "

1796 1 11:55 " 7.9
↑

1797 3C.2 12:15 " 7
↑

.3 12:30 (E) " 7
↑

.4 12:15 (E) " 7
↑

1808 1 12:30 8.0
↑

1809 5 12:06 8
↑

Rou EAC '97 #95 was a 1795 Gb
showing L/C undertype 83.1 g.

< You show 103.1 g as low weight ! >
also have Gb @ 106 + 108

In addition to thin pl LE

And, of course, two 956a's

32.1.3 has crack thru A1 to two leaves + berry
.6 no crack (top leaf at r. edge of S2)

31.1.3 no .4 no .6 no

But at prooferama - found four diff die states

97.3a.3^{.10} 12:00

first 7 shows EF45

.2, .4 56711

can't tell

97.3b.1, ^{3, 4, 7} 12:00

.6 is 12:10

c 09.5 (01320) depression along side, but weight?
"cuds" level with top of date, off-center

96.1.3 labeled - appears to be about 11:45

4/13/98



114 Polo Drive
Salisbury, NC
28144

Hi Tett!

Enclosed is a marked 2X2
for measuring reverse rotations.
An example is 1804 C-6: it
should always be about centered
between 11:00 and 12:00 (about
11:30). "Normal" alignment is
12:00. Each hour of rotation
 $= 30^\circ$. Thus, 1804 C-6
is at 11:30 or 15° CCW
(counter clockwise). Thanks
again and email me if you
have any questions.

-Pen

Subj: Re: Your article in P-W
Date: 98-04-10 12:40:16 EDT



Hi Tett!

It was good seeing you in Boston. It would be greatly appreciated if you could determine the approximate reverse rotations (even if they are the "normal alignment" at 12:00) of the following half cent varieties in your collection for my upcoming book. I recall describing briefly to you how Bob Grellman and I do this, but if you have any questions let me know. Many thanks!!

Data needed on: 1794 C-2b, 1794 C-3b, 1794 C-6b, 1796 C-1, 1797 C-3c, and 1808 C-1. In addition, I am interested in the reverse rotation of Cohen:278--the light-weight 1809 C-5 described with obverse cuds.

Ron

2

Subj: Re: Your article in P-W
Date: 98-04-10 16:31:57 EDT

Ron

Will do.

However, we will be traveling until mid-May, and it will probably take me a couple of weeks to catch up with rush and past-due stuff. So I am planning for numismatic stuff to be on the June-July schedule. If this is a problem for you, please let me know.

To make sure we are on the same page, why don't you send me one of the little cardboard flips marked up the way you want the rotation described.

Tett

①

Subj: Re: Your article in P-W

Date: 98-04-10 12:40:16 EDT

From: [REDACTED]

Reply: [REDACTED]

To: [REDACTED]

Hi Tett!

It was good seeing you in Boston. It would be greatly appreciated if you could determine the approximate reverse rotations (even if they are the "normal alignment" at 12:00) of the following half cent varieties in your collection for my upcoming book. I recall describing briefly to you how Bob Grellman and I do this, but if you have any questions let me know. Many thanks!!

Data needed on: 1794 C-2b, 1794 C-3b, 1794 C-6b, 1796 C-1, 1797 C-3c, and 1808 C-1. In addition, I am interested in the reverse rotation of Cohen:278--the light-weight 1809 C-5 described with obverse cuds.

Ron

2

Subj: Re: Your article in P-W
Date: 98-04-10 16:31:57 EDT

[Redacted]

Ron

Will do.

However, we will be traveling until mid-May, and it will probably take me a couple of weeks to catch up with rush and past-due stuff. So I am planning for numismatic stuff to be on the June-July schedule. If this is a problem for you, please let me know.


To make sure we are on the same page, why don't you send me one of the little cardboard flips marked up the way you want the rotation described.

Tett

[Redacted]

3

Subj: Re: Half Cent Rev. Rotations
Date: 98-04-11 10:43:35 EDT

A large rectangular area of the email body is redacted with a solid black box.

Tett,

Your time frame is no problem, although I would prefer your input in June rather than July. I'll get a marked 2x2 flip out to you next week. Thanks again!!

Ron

4

Subj: **Thin planchet lettered edge half cents**
Date: 6/5/98 9:15:56 AM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
Reply to: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Hi Tett,

I'm writing an article, possibly two, for P-W in response to Bill Weber's and Ray Rouse's response to your article. I am firmly convinced that the disparities in describing half cent "subvarieties" in those two articles have led to more cloudiness than clarity in the waters of understanding.

I have a question for you. In Bill's March 1989 P-W article "Sinking the Subs" he mentioned that he was aware of two thin planchet specimens of 1795 C-2. Are these two of the three that you listed in your article or are these different specimens? If they are different specimens, do you know what weights they were?

Best, Ron

5

Subj: **Re: Rotation flip**
Date: 6/11/98 3:55:23 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
Re: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]

Tett,

There's no need to apologize. I lose things all the time. I had a problem receiving email earlier so I didn't get your message until 4:50 pm EDT today (Thursday). I'll get another flip out to you in tomorrow morning's mail. If you don't receive it by Monday, I'm happy to wait two more weeks for your data. I'll enclose a copy of the article I'm submitting to P-W about the thin planchet lettered edge half cents. In my article, I propose alternate explanations to your trial piece idea (which you probably won't be too pleased with). Feel free to rebut the article in P-W.

Thanks again for your help!!

Ron

5A

Subj: Thin plachets
Date: 6/11/98 12:40:40 PM Central Daylight Time
From: [REDACTED]
To: Craigs109

Dear Craig,

Thanks very much for your letter of May 4. It does confirm one thing, which is that you were the right person to ask for information on this subject.

Although the hypothesis I had is contradicted by your evidence, there does seem to be some "trial" characteristics to some of these pieces, as you point out. Moreover, although several of the specimens that I listed were within the range that Ron Manley found, some of the others were below the range of those he listed. This might lend some support to an explanation that associated them in some way with the lower weight standard.

Even though I am not a large cent person, I truly enjoyed your January article on sampling. Unfortunately, my math background is more in the fields of number theory and symbolic logic than in statistics, it was a pleasure to read such a carefully reaoned presentation.

Regards, Tett